NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

10c

Royal Oak, Michigan | March 30, 1942 | Subscription Three Dollars Per Year

JEWS PLOT TO BAN 'SOCIAL JUSTICE'

(See Pages 3, 4)

MacArthur Can Whip the Japs— But Can F.D.R.?

(See Pages 6, 7)

Why Mohandas Gandhi Wears a 'Loin Cloth'

(Page 11)

POLITICS AND THE 40-HOUR WEEK ★ WE ARE NOT ON THE DEFENSIVE ★ PAGANISTIC TREND IN AMERICAN MAGAZINES

Dinner Chat

We Are Not On the Defensive!

IN ALL the current smearing of SOCIAL JUSTICE by the newspapers and magazines there is one very important fact to remember:

SOCIAL JUSTICE is *not on the defensive!*

The smear attacks against Father Coughlin and SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine originated with anti-Christian un-Americans who cannot stand our searchlight on the facts about Communism, and are desperate to extinguish the light.

Last week, they used their boasted power over the press to get the newspapers to help them.

Not one newspaper writer or editor in all America called either Father Coughlin or the editorial offices of SOCIAL JUSTICE to check on the "facts" handed to them ready-made by the smear brigade. They printed without question the dirty smear — mistakes, libel and all!

It had become so commonplace for the irresponsible Jewish and Communist press to lie about Father Coughlin and SOCIAL JUSTICE that our critics have grown overbold. In this latest case, they overstepped all the proprieties. However, it is not they but the victimized newspapers who will have to pay the consequences for the libelous errors.

* * *

One of the comments most frequently parroted by the Red press and its Jewish echo is that SOCIAL JUSTICE "attacks the Allies but not the Axis."

Any consistent reader of SOCIAL JUSTICE remembers Father Coughlin's broadcasts, and our editorials, about "Brown" and "Red" Bolshevism and the editorial excoriation of the Nazi paganism master-minded by Rosenberg, to the utter demoralization of Christian Germany.

All this has appeared in SOCIAL JUSTICE time and again. So much so that there was virtually a "German boycott" of this magazine. For a time almost every letter of cancellation was signed by a German name because, as they said, we were "parroting Jewish lies about Hitler." Whereas, we were simply telling the whole truth as we saw it.

Not one Jewish critic has ever taken note of all this. They could not admit it, and still have "a case."

But—one can't always succeed *on half a record;* and that's what Jewish opponents of Christian principle have in this instance tried to do.

Suppress the facts, silence the truth-tellers, ban SOCIAL JUSTICE —these tactics can be employed whenever there are enough influential officials in high places, but they will not succeed this time.

You can't fool all the people all the time, as Lincoln told us; any more than His foes could seal Christ in a tomb forever.

* * *

As the *Christian Science Monitor* had to assert: "This article will not deal with the past crusades of SOCIAL JUSTICE!"

Instead, they printed a five-column smear of SOCIAL JUSTICE, omitting completely all mention of any good we have tried to do while more able Christians than the editors of SOCIAL JUSTICE have been silenced by authority, intimidated by mortgage pressure, or from cowardice.

We're not asking any glory or credit; we're satisfied to stand on the record. But you can be sure that we're going to insist that *the whole record be presented!*

We repeat, SOCIAL JUSTICE is not on the defensive.

We shall continue positively pro-Christ and pro-America. We shall never be content to stop with mere negatives. We intend to *carry the battle of Christian principle into the very camp of anti-Christ.*

The enemies of Christ and Christian truth have had but one "defense" in all history. Silence the accuser; put out the spotlight.

Perhaps—for the first time in the world—it will not work!

That must all depend on whether there is enough intelligence, and enough courage in the hearts of Christian Americans.

God is our strength; Christ is our Hope. We fear no man.

Read your *Lenten Missal* carefully and with attention *every day!*

Six Years Ago

MUCH of the edition of SOCIAL JUSTICE which appeared the week of April 3, 1936, was given over to organization plans of the National Union for Social Justice.

But several comments of significance are encountered by the reviewer.

For example, editorial comment on Mussolini's abolition of the Italian Chamber of Deputies questioned whether Fascism really would achieve what it proclaimed as its objective; namely, "the attainment of a higher degree of social justice."

We said:

"It is hard to see just what his conception of a higher degree of social justice really means . . . It really amounts to a type of Bolshevism, industrialists hold . . .

"When it is considered that all outside trade with foreign nations practically amounts to a monopoly, that all banking facilities throughout Italy are under State influence and control, and now all major industries are brought under the jurisdiction of the State, the fundamental idea of State Socialism would seem to be fulfilled."

* * *

"Since March 7th, Adolf Hitler has displaced Benito Mussolini as the Number 1 threat to world peace," another article said.

". . . Hitler," the commentator continued, "rose to power by capitalizing Germany's common resentment of the savageries of the *Versailles Treaty* . . . Throughout her years of suffering she (Germany) has constantly borne the conviction that the *Versailles Treaty* was a treaty of revenge and not a treaty to perpetuate peace and honor among nations."

* * *

An editorial comment observed: "Capitalism, which is but the body for which Individualism supplies a sordid and sadly corrupted soul, must never be confounded with capital and private property, whereof a wider distribution alone can save civilization. The abuses of this individualistic capitalism—especially its artificially contrived and constantly recurring crises, with their attendant evils of unemployment and widespread destitution — have proved to be the prolific cause of Communism and of all its fantastic and futile panaceas that would destroy civilization."

Five Years Ago

ARMY DAY, the anniversary of the start of World War I, was in the air and no doubt colored the contents of the issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE five years ago this week.

A page one headline read: *"U.S. Will Conscript Wealth as Well as Men in Next War; Legion Bill in Congress on Army Day."* This was a proposed enactment of the famous Principle 15 of the National Union program.

"War Won't Find America 'Unprepared'" was the optimistic headline of an article based on the modernization then under way of all our armed forces.

We said:

"The United States has engaged in six major wars. In every instance it has been caught unprepared, and the result has been a needless waste of lives and money.

"There is hardly an authority on the World War but who believes we would have been spared British interference and the German insolence that finally got us into the conflict, if we had been better prepared on land and sea."

Our commentator expressed the opinion that it would not happen again. But, how wrong we were!

* * *

Another analysis was captioned: *"Why All This Talk of War Peril from Helpless Dictator Powers?—New Line-up Is 'Haves' vs. 'Have Nots'."*

Our Washington correspondent said:

"The maneuvers of European diplomacy during the last two or three years have lined the 'have' nations against the 'have not' nations. A war between those two forces, however fiercely it might rage for a time, would indeed be but a murderous puppet show.

"Underlying the long-term strategy of the old-new diplomatic alignment in Europe is the military strategy of massing resources plus armies against mere military machines!"

That, we remind you, was 1937. Continuing, the writer asked:

"Is the 'national mind' of the United States being 'conditioned' to support, emotionally at least, an exterminative aggression against the 'have not' nations?"

Readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE are in a much better position to answer that question today — five years after.

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education.
Just living annual wage.
Nationalization of important public resources.
Private ownership of all other property.
Control of private property for public good.
Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a Government-owned Central Bank.
Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.
Cost of living maintained on an even keel.
Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.
Labor's right to organize.
Recall of non-productive bonds.
Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.
Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.
Simplification of Government and lower taxes.
Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war.
Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with Government's chief concern for the poor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE National Weekly. Copyrighted 1942 by the Social Justice Publishing Company, publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price, United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks are required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the post office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor; Cora Quinlan, Secretary-Treasurer.

SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted either wholly or in part, without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from SOCIAL JUSTICE for digest, advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.

Vol. 9 March 30, 1942 No. 12

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Name_____

Address_____

City_____ State_____

Subscription rate $3 a year Renewal ☐ New ☐

(Remit by Check or Money Order)

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., Royal Oak, Michigan

Here Is the Jewish Answer:

BAN "SOCIAL JUSTICE"!

The time for decisive action is here.

Nazi spies have been rounded up and convicted. Blatant pro-fascists and anti-Semites like Deatherage have been smoked out and deprived of defense jobs. Nazi agents like Viereck are being brought to judgment.

But the hunting down of such apostles of Hitler is only the first skirmish against the stealthy advance of the American fifth column. The times call for a full-scale offensive against the traitors.

The past years have taught us all the contents of the whole bag of Nazi tricks. In the interest of our preservation as a nation and a democracy, we must put this knowledge to the fullest use. The Reichstag trial, the crime against the Spanish Republic, Munich, the betrayal of France—these and countless other tragic events have made the Nazi strategy clear as daylight. The counter-strategy is equally clear. Render our fifth column impotent. They are traducing American democracy. They are helping the enemy. Deprive them of every vestige of public influence, and we shall be far on the road to final victory over Hitler.

One of the most influential of American fascists is Charles E. Coughlin. His anti-Semitic, pro-Hitler policy before the war is common knowledge. But as *PM* said of him: "Dec. 7 was just another day on the calendar so far as he was concerned." Coughlin's *Social Justice* is at the present moment the mouthpiece of the fifth column in the United States. *Social Justice* and the Coughlinite front are in the most literal sense enemy troops on our own soil. A healthy sense of self-preservation dictates that we snatch Coughlin's poisonous weapon from him.

***Social Justice* has consciously incited opposition to every measure and effort to win the war. *Social Justice* has called upon anti-Semitic and fascist Christian Fronters to capture positions in civilian defense for disruption of our nation's security. The landing of American troops in Ireland was dubbed an "invasion." The Hitler line of calling the democracies "plutocracies" is unfailingly re-echoed in the pages of *Social Justice*. The Japanese policy from Manchuria to Pearl Harbor is none too subtly defended. *Social Justice* has blamed America for Japan's treacherous aggression. Jews are perpetually baited. England is said to have aims identical with Japan. Our important ally Russia is attacked as the real peril to America in order to disrupt the unity of nations which is the only guarantee for the destruction of the Axis. Marshall Petain, under whose puppet regime the Nuremberg laws became the laws of France, is praised as a man of virtue and honor. We are urged to "Keep America Christian !" We are slyly warmed up to Hitler's "new order."**

This is treason! When a dagger is pointed at your heart, you thrust it away. *Social Justice* is a dagger poised over the heart of American democracy. THE JEWISH SURVEY has in its columns exposed the danger of Coughlin. The time has arrived for decisive action against the enemy at home. With full awareness of all its implications and as a measure of defense of all our liberties, THE JEWISH SURVEY demands that *Social Justice* be banned.

Reproduced herewith is page 3 of the March issue of the *Jewish Survey* Magazine, on the cover page of which appears the headline: "Stop SOCIAL JUSTICE."

In our issue of March 16th SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine quoted from a radio address delivered in 1933 by Mr. Samuel Untermeyer calling upon the world to support a Jewish boycott against the German people.

In the same issue of the *Jewish Survey* which calls for our suppression, Mr. Sholem Asch reiterates the words of the late Mr. Untermeyer. (See Page 4)

Comment

'Ban SOCIAL JUSTICE' Is Jewish Demand

"SOCIAL JUSTICE and the Coughlinite front are in the most literal sense *enemy troops on our own soil.*"

"SOCIAL JUSTICE has *consciously incited opposition* to every measure and effort to win the war."

"With *full awareness of all its implications*, and as a measure of defense of all our liberties, THE JEWISH SURVEY demands that SOCIAL JUSTICE be banned!"

HERE, THEN, is the Jewish answer to recent issues of SOCIAL JUSTICE.

It is a characteristic answer: "Ban SOCIAL JUSTICE!"

It is an old custom: Never meet an argument or defend a charge—but, silence the accuser!

The custom is more than 2,000 years old.

In the space usually given to this department (Page 3) is reproduced a photostat of an editorial in the *Jewish Survey*.

"Our editorial urging that SOCIAL JUSTICE be banned is intended to impel our readers to take up the campaign," says an editorial note in their March issue.

The editorial board of *The Jewish Survey* is listed as "Rockwell Kent, Viola Brothers Shore, Max Weber, and Louis Harap, managing editor."

"Ban SOCIAL JUSTICE," demands the magazine on Page 3, while on Page 8, the pre-eminent Sholem Asch is quoted as follows:

"I have only one wish. I don't want to die yet. I wish to live to see the day when the Russian army marches into Berlin from one side and the British army from the other. ***I want to see the Jews of the allied nations meet and clasp hands over the defeated Nazis in Berlin.***"

* * *

"There can be no letup until all pronounced pro-Fascists and anti-Semites are completely balked and blasted," writes A. A. Freedlander in *The Sentinel* (March 12).

The *Jewish Criterion* (March 13) adds the helpful hint in reference to SOCIAL JUSTICE: "The co-operation of the Post Office Department will be sought to weed out publications which make vicious anti-Semitism and pro-Fascism the main theme of their columns."

So that's the plan. Ban SOCIAL JUSTICE from the United States mails because it is "anti-Semitic" for Christians to oppose the advance of Communism in America.

* * *

We defy the *Jewish Survey* to ban SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine. We dare Jewry to achieve that objective.

The same un-American *clique* silenced Father Coughlin, the nation's beloved priest of the radio, because back in 1938 he invited Jews to join Christians in condemning all persecution—the persecution and murder of millions of Christians in Soviet Russia as well as a fine levied against 600,000 Jews in Nazi Germany.

So, let the *Jewish Survey* and refugee revolutionaries ask the U. S. Post Office Department to stop SOCIAL JUSTICE because Jews do not like what outspoken Christians have to say about Communism.

But do not let the *Jewish Survey* and its powerful backers think for a moment that the American people will swallow the libel that "Goebbels' gold" pays for the paper and ink, or meets the editorial payroll of this Christian journal.

Hundreds of thousands of Christian Americans who subscribe to SOCIAL JUSTICE—and their number is upping fast—know better.

Go ahead, *Jewish Survey;* do your worst; ban SOCIAL JUSTICE — and then observe whether the tide of anti-Semitism in America fades out or flames from a prairie fire into an uncontrollable holocaust!

The worst possible injustice that SOCIAL JUSTICE could do to the Jews of America would be to discontinue publication of its own volition, seizing this opportunity to blame the Jews for our retirement. Were we to succumb to such a satanic temptation, the pogroms which crimsoned the soil of Europe would rank as a poor second to what would occur on the streets of New York.

Leading Newspapers Fall for Smear Plot

TWO weeks ago (March 16), SOCIAL JUSTICE warned:

"As for SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine, we are not very much disturbed about these rantings in the Communist and Jewish press. True, powerful influences are moving heaven and earth to 'plant' the smears in more respectable journals. All their money and power are bound to succeed, eventually, in some quarters."

That warning was uttered not a day too soon, for the next week saw a Communist-Jewish, master-minded, anti-Christian smear spread upon the pages of the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *Kansas City Star*, the *Cleveland Press*, the *Cincinnati Post*, the *Washington Post*, and the *New York Herald Tribune*—to mention but a few of the outstanding papers which thought that something drastic ought to be done about Father Coughlin.

In nearly every case, the smear appeared under the "by-line" of some well known staff writer. The implication was left with the reader that the editorial department of each newspaper thought it up all by themselves; that they had stood just about all they could of "Coughlin's pro-Nazi propaganda" and it was time to "do something about it."

Quite obviously, American editors from Maine to California do not all have the same bright idea at the same time. It just couldn't be a coincidence.

When you get all the papers—as we do here at SOCIAL JUSTICE—and spread them out before you, you can see that it was no coincidence, but a concerted smear campaign, about which the several by-line writers themselves probably knew very little.

Their repeated errors—and the same errors—makes that plain. Why waste words—the Jews and Communists simply "planted" their smear in the daily newspapers, as SOCIAL JUSTICE, the week before, had warned that they were trying to do.

* * *

The *Christian Science Monitor*, an "international newspaper" published in Boston, gave five columns of its March 13th edition to SOCIAL JUSTICE. So far as we know it was the first mention of our national weekly that appeared in the columns of the *Monitor*.

The story bore the "by-line" of R. H. Markham, "staff correspondent of the *Christian Science Monitor*," and a 3-column reproduction of the front page of SOCIAL JUSTICE for February 9th illustrated the story.

Of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine Mr. Markham says:

"Its *aim is to make Americans feel that their country is an extremely bad place in which to live.*"

Now what does Mr. Markham or the *Monitor* know about "the aim" of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine? Certainly, no editorial worker on our paper, and no reader of these columns in the six years of publication, was ever conscious of such an "aim."

To impute an "aim" is one of the oldest mistakes of amateur journalism. Editors and lawyers call it "imputation of motive." Nobody can ever seen inside another man's mind or heart. It is never safe, nor is it good journalism, to impute a motive from a warped construction of some ready-made smear handout. Especially, when you get it from an untrustworthy source.

To continue the quote:

"An impressive method for putting the spotlight on defects is to quote criticism from widely different sources. That makes the complaints seem authentic and objective. SOCIAL JUSTICE *does this in a very telling way.*"

And, again,

"Many of its analyses are well founded, and not a few of its statements are true."

But the *Monitor* writer fell into the error

(Continued on Page 5)

Index to Comment

We Are Not on the Defensive ..... Page 2

'Ban SOCIAL JUSTICE Is Jewish Demand'; Leading Newspapers Fall for Smear Plot ..... Page 4

P.M.'s Smear List ..... Page 5

Editorial: MacArthur to Australia ..... Page 6

Politics and the 40-Hour Week; Tax 'Hokum' ..... Page 7

Is This Pro-Axis?; Censorship and Propaganda; Plenty of Rubber ..... Page 8

The Paganistic Trend in American Magazines; Effective Language ..... Page 9

Why Mohandas Gandhi Wears a 'Loin Cloth' ..... Page 11

Untermeyer Speech Still Available ..... Page 15

Comment

(Continued from Page 4)

of the other Coughlin-haters as the following telegram sent to the Rev. Father Coughlin will show:

"Boston, Mass., 311 pm Mar. 17, 1942
"Rev. Charles E. Coughlin
"Referring to your telegram we corrected in our very next edition on March 13 the reference to you as editor to read: 'founded by.'
"Erwin D. Canham, Managing Editor
"*The Christian Science Monitor.*"

The correction was made apparently in the first paragraph but not the second. The "corrected" article started out as follows:

"One of America's extensively circulated national magazines is the 20-page weekly SOCIAL JUSTICE, published in Royal Oak, Michigan, near Detroit. According to its title it was founded in 1936 by the Rev. Chas. E. Coughlin. It is believed to be his mouthpiece.

"How many *readers the Rev. Mr. Coughlin has,* I do not know," etc., etc.

One more quotation will suffice:

"This article will not deal with the past crusades of SOCIAL JUSTICE."

Neither will any other critic of Father Coughlin or SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine. Why?

We have been publishing for six years. Why is the first mention of this magazine in the *Christian Science Monitor* a five-column smear, which carefully explains that it will not "deal with the past crusades"?

* * *

No smear writer expects, or wants, an answer to his libels.

Owing to the importance of the *Monitor* as an international newspaper with a reputation for accuracy and fairness, the libel against Father Coughlin and Social Justice Publishing Company is an interesting study for the legal department.

If Father Coughlin had plotted a comeback financed by his detractors, strategy could not have conceived a better entrapment than the pit his enemies have dug for themselves in this latest newspaper series of libelous attacks. There is little question but these powerfully-supported journals are financially responsible. As much cannot be said for the Communist and Jewish press *clique* who master-minded the smear.

* * *

An editorial in the *Cincinnati Post*—reproduced word for word in other Scripps-Howard newspapers—goes away out on the limb of editorial libel. Says the *Post*:

"Father Coughlin *is preaching* pure and unadulterated Nazi propaganda despite the fact that he is a citizen of the United States."

The chief thing the matter with that comment is that for two years the Rev. Father Coughlin has not "preached" anything except Christian sermons from the pulpit of the Shrine of the Little Flower. His "preaching," of the sort the editor thinks he is talking about, stopped when Jewish Communists had him put off the air in 1939.

The next *Post* paragraph reads:

"He could not do a better job for Joseph Goebbels if he were being paid a million dollars a year in Nazi gold."

Scripps-Howard's highly paid editorial writer then continues:

"He (meaning Father Coughlin) has Goebbels' own diabolical cunning for twisting half-truths, for crying sanctimoniously that 'Communism is the real enemy of civilization" (Isn't it?); "for fanning the flames of hatred against the Jews as a scapegoat."

There it is, "the Jews," again.

"Father Coughlin's *doctrines, taken as a whole,* do not give the impression that he wants America to win . . ."

That's enough!

Father Coughlin's "doctrines" are the doctrines of Jesus Christ and the Catholic Church. Years ago, he applied them very specifically in the Sixteen Principles of Social Justice, epitomized from the encyclicals of the great Popes Leo and Pius. What have they to do with America winning or losing a war?

* * *

The usually careful *Kansas City Star*—founded by a better newspaper man than ever worked for it—also parrots the same "million-dollar slander."

An editorial page feature on March 11th in the *Star* says: "Meantime, Father Coughlin, the publisher of SOCIAL JUSTICE, contributed his bit to national unity," etc., etc., and also, "Later, Coughlin showed clearly . . ."

Who told the *Star* that? We think we know. The *Star's* old habit of always burying a credit somewhere "passes the buck" to *Friends of Democracy, Inc., New York.* That brings us right back to the old Kansas City preacher of feather fan dance notoriety, "the Rev." Birkhead, Unitarian "front man" for the Jewish smear brigade.

So that's where all this newspaper noise came from!

Years ago, he wanted SOCIAL JUSTICE suppressed for "anti-Semitism." Now his crowd wants us closed because we re-printed Mr. Untermeyer's appeal of 1933 for a world boycott on Germany to avenge the "aristocrats of the world."

* * *

And, while we're down in that general vicinity, here is an editorial quotation from the "*Missouri Cash Book,*" a newspaper published at Jackson, in southeast Missouri.

Under the caption, "*Coughlin Tops Filth Columnists,*" this editorial writer certainly "goes over the top":

"Coughlin, generally alluded to as 'Father,' is in the opinion of the *Cash Book* one of the most dangerous and contemptible fifth columnists in the United States. We think him brainless, radical, race-prejudiced and un-American, and if it were not for his demagogic proclivities, that he would not so much as attract public attention.

"He *is the editor of* the publication called SOCIAL JUSTICE, which *should be barred from the mails,* and its editor (sic) *interned for the duration of the war.*

"Unfortunately, he (the man means Fr. Coughlin) has some followers who add nothing to our country's effort to maintain the morale of our people and their confidence in our effort to maintain our freedom of religious worship; hence it *is the duty of the Catholic Church* to strip him of the cloth under which he hides.

"SOCIAL JUSTICE, *edited by Coughlin,* is one of the anti-Administration publications responsible for our unpreparedness . . ."

Enough. The editor here picks up the rest of the smear hand-out.

Too bad, the "*Cash Book*" is probably a misnomer.

* * *

"Canned" editorials master-minded by N.E.A., the Cleveland syndicate, also picked up the smear with the result that many smaller newspapers who buy their editorials instead of writing them have been innocently victimized by helping to spread the libel.

In these cases, when you reprimand your local editor, criticize him—if you must—for mental laziness in *buying* his opinions instead of *having* them.

We cannot wax too wroth with the *Herald Tribune,* which simply included us with Hitler's little helpers among the American press and flattered our vanity with this paragraph:

"Perhaps *the most influential* of the publications is SOCIAL JUSTICE, the weekly magazine published in Royal Oak, Michigan, and founded by the Rev. Charles E. Coughlin. SOCIAL JUSTICE is generally believed to have a circulation of about 200,000 copies."

The *Washington Post* picked up, with credit, the *Herald Tribune* story.

* * *

And out of all this nation-wide smearing of SOCIAL JUSTICE and Father Coughlin, how many newspaper men do you think called, wrote, or made contact with, the rectory at the Shrine or SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine office?

You're right the first time. NOT ONE!

Do you believe SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine is stronger or weaker as a result of this new nation-wide smear by American newspapers, master-minded by Communist Jews?

You're right again: so do we!

PM's Smear List

NO SMEAR survey would be complete without the masters of the technique represented. According to *PM* (Feb. 20) the newspapers were "scooped" in this manner:

"SOCIAL JUSTICE is conducting a steady campaign to undermine the confidence of its readers in our American Government and its leaders."

"SOCIAL JUSTICE, of course, is particularly bitter against the Russian partner in the anti-Axis lineup."

"SOCIAL JUSTICE is still peddling that old peanut: Hitler is protecting the world from Communism."

"SOCIAL JUSTICE has interpreted the war as a struggle between the 'haves' and the 'have nots'."

"SOCIAL JUSTICE *has counselled hoarding.*"

"SOCIAL JUSTICE has advised its followers to 'capture every office' in civilian defense organizations."

"SOCIAL JUSTICE is still stirring up anti-Semitism by repeated sniping at the international bankers. It implies that Kuhn, Loeb & Co., the Jewish banking firm, owns half the world, including much of the Malay tin and rubber sources. (The fact is that Kuhn, Loeb *is a relatively small company.*)"

EDITOR'S NOTE: Laudatory writeups in the current Jewish press on the occasion of Kuhn-Loeb's 75th anniversary as a banking house, give an impressive list of top rank American corporations in which "K.L." have what is modestly called a "continuing interest." From a perusal of the list of these railroads and other utilities, we'd say that for "a relatively small company" the young men at Kay-Ell are not doing badly at all!

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

MacArthur to Australia

MR. ROOSEVELT'S transfer of General MacArthur to Australia was the brightest ray in the American war effort since Pearl Harbor.

Moreover, the wholesome propaganda which heralded the incident accomplished more in steadying our staggering national morale than did all the political fireside chats and tons of literature which have been issued from Washington.

The stature of General MacArthur towers far above other pigmy personages in the national picture, not necessarily because he is so tall but because they are so small.

Following his most magnificent exploits in the Philippines, MacArthur shares prominence with Soviet Russia's Timoshenko and bids fair to rise to Himalayan heights over the prostrate figures of desert-wandering politicians at home who are responsible for the inefficiency which characterizes Washington.

In selecting MacArthur to take the last stand against the well-trained and well-equipped regiments of the Nipponese, Mr. Roosevelt indicates that, at long last, he is backing away from the advisers who have been surrounding him. The President knows the place MacArthur holds in the hearts of the American public. He knows the new leader of the United Nations' forces in Australia is evaluated from Boston to San Francisco, from Duluth to New Orleans, more than are the Hopkinses, the Frankfurters, the Philip Murrays, etc., combined.

* * *

Still withal, we Americans know that MacArthur is no miracle man. He needs more than his bare, bruised hands with which to fight the mechanized Japanese. His genius is limited by the amount of men, munitions, tanks, fighting planes and materiel with which he will be supplied. While we know that MacArthur can achieve victory with less than any other military leader in America, we also know that if he does not receive at least the "less," he will become a victim of the Japanese as surely as did the leaders of the Dutch on Java and the British at Singapore.

Consequently, a tremendous "if" looms upon the horizon of tomorrow's battles in the land "down under." *If sufficient men and equipment will be sent to MacArthur, he can win and will win; but if he is denied that support, he can lose and will lose.*

MacArthur needs airplanes, tanks and ships.

Airplanes, tanks and ships need an abundance of factory workers and an abundance of hours.

An abundance of factory workers and an abundance of hours will not exist unless Mr. Roosevelt so ordains.

In fine, MacArthur's success or defeat depends upon the President of the United States.

The people of this country understand that. Even though Douglas MacArthur might be forced to surrender—and God forbid it—our citizenry will not blame him. More than ever will the thoughtful people of this Republic revere him if he is compelled by circumstances at home to fight a losing cause abroad.

* * *

In this connection, it is appropriate to speculate on the plans of the Japanese as they begin their assault against Australia. It seems to us that the Japanese will land on the mainland of Australia. Likely, the enemy will lose many of their small craft in effecting a landing. Nevertheless, having subdued the northern ports, we surmise they will attempt to establish air fields for their fighting planes.

As speedily as possible, we suspect, Tokyo will order at least 1,000 fighting planes to be based on the mainland of Australia. While enemy bombers attempt to pulverize Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane, Jap fighting planes will engage the Allied fighters in, possibly, the world's greatest air battle.

If the planes of the Allies are not victorious, Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane will fall to the Japs; the Australian armies will be forced to move inland; and the civilian population remaining in the cities will be held as hostages.

That is not a pretty picture. The entire outcome of the battle for Australia and victory for MacArthur, we venture, depends on the supremacy of fighting planes more than upon bombers, ships and infantry men.

Therefore, to nullify Japanese strategy, speedy help and plentiful help must be forthcoming from the United States within the next 120 days else MacArthur, though he be the world's greatest general, cannot be expected to perform a miracle.

* * *

If MacArthur fails, the resentment of the American people, we re-state, will not be leveled against the hero of the Bataan foxholes, but against those Washingtonians who are responsible for solving the problem of production and transportation. They are on trial —not MacArthur.

If MacArthur fails because the problems of production and transportation were not solved when they could have been solved before November, there will be many Americans suspecting that Washington planned it that way lest MacArthur should return to this nation and overturn the Hopkinses, the Frankfurters and the Reds inside government who have been responsible for the policy of "too little and too late."

If MacArthur is victorious, those responsible for his support will share with him any glory he wins.

The General Speaks

AMPLE corroboration of the central thought expressed above came from General MacArthur himself in his first interview with the press after arriving in Australia.

Said MacArthur: "I am glad to be in immediate co-operation with the Australian soldier. I know him well from World War days and admire him greatly.

"I have every confidence in the ultimate success of our joint cause, *but success in modern war requires something more than courage and willingness to die.*

"It requires careful preparation.

"This means furnishing sufficient troops and sufficient material to meet the known strength of a potential enemy. *No general can make something from nothing. My success or failure will depend primarily upon the resources which our prospective governments place at my disposal.*

"My faith in them is complete. In any event, I shall do my best. I shall keep the soldier's faith."

* * *

We do not question General MacArthur's ability to fulfill the duties assigned to him, providing he gets the necessary cooperation from Washington and from the nation. But after examining the record of New Deal muddling and inefficiency, we frankly have our doubts as to whether the bureaucrats can deliver the goods. Perhaps they can. We hope they can—for America's sake.

Comment

Politics and the Forty-Hour Week

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT strongly opposes any modification of the 40-hour week plan for labor.

For more than a year our Commander-in-Chief has been insisting that production on the home front is co-equally important to fighting on the military front; for without tanks, airplanes and mechanized equipment our potential army of 7-million soldiers will prove no match for an actual mechanized army of 2-million soldiers.

Thus, painting glowing pictures of ships, bombers, jeeps and armament, a goal was set for 1943 beyond which date, so intimated Mr. Roosevelt, we cannot afford to lag except under the penalty of defeat.

The goal set by Mr. Roosevelt for home front production will not be reached in 1942 or 1943, under present conditions, as most honest observers realize. This realization is predicated upon the tortoise speed manifested in many branches of industry as well as upon many factors compoundedly described as "muddling."

The 40-hour week plan, while permitting labor to work more than 40-hours, exacts time and a half or double time pay for all hours worked over and above 40 hours. Does labor want the fat pay envelope and the lean production line? Does Mr. Roosevelt fear losing his political prestige if he should modify the peacetime policies of the 40-hour week? If a war is to be won, prestige, fat pay envelopes and lean production lines must go.

* * *

Unfortunately, it is not likely that the tonnage of cargo ships which Mr. Roosevelt instructed America to produce will be achieved, under present conditions, despite the Herculean efforts put forth by Admiral Land. Axis submarines are destroying in the Caribbean and elsewhere more ships than we are building.

That one item related to ships should be a deciding factor in settling the debate on the 40-hour week policy, for without a plenitude of ships the war can be lost by 1943.

Practically every informed person in America realizes this. Nevertheless, Mr. Roosevelt is opposed to any modification of the 40-hour labor law even for those employed in fabricating ocean-going ships.

Granted that our national production of guns, tanks and fighting planes will even surpass the mark anticipated by Mr. Roosevelt, what use are they in an offensive warfare to be waged 7,000 miles distant from America if they are warehoused at Seattle, San Francisco, San Pedro or any other port on this continent?

The question, therefore, resolves itself as to why the President obdurately opposes setting aside the 40-hour week for labor. The answer is obvious: He is a politician, first, last and always. As such he fears the loss of political support as represented by the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. As such he follows the dictates of labor leaders and fears to risk offending them and their followers. As such, it might be construed, he desires to pursue his New Deal policies though a World War threatens to isolate America as it has isolated and is destroying—at least temporarily—the British Empire.

* * *

Unquestionably, Mr. Roosevelt has been a friend of labor. But his friendliness in times of crisis is of a questionable nature. It is a type of friendliness which lacks courage to indict the wrong-doings of one's beloved. It is a type of friendliness which kills with kindness. It is a type of friendliness which, through indulgence, leads a friend into perdition.

For the past several years labor, more sinned against than sinning, has been a prodigal son as far as the great white father at Washington is concerned. The fatted calf was killed for labor. The ring of honor was placed upon labor's finger. The purple robe of power was placed upon labor's shoulder.

Labor sat down at a banquet table, having been forced, hitherto to sate its appetite upon the husks thrown to the swine of this world.

That the enemy is at the gate preparing to tear down the walls and sack the paternal home has not fully dawned upon Mr. Roosevelt while he still gives orders to his servants and faithful sons to continue with the banquet for the prodigal.

Orders are given to all citizens and soldiers in the household to serve, to sacrifice, to submit.

But no orders to serve, to sacrifice or to submit are given to labor.

At this writing there are strikes in progress and in the making—not heralded by the newspapers. Shop stewards make their rounds daily and, in many instances, frown upon any efforts to speed up production. Conventions of labor leaders are in session demanding as much as a 15 per cent wage raise for their followers.

In the meantime MacArthur goes to Australia. Indeed, he is promised more fighting planes. But England promised the defenders of Singapore more fighting planes—a promise that was never fulfilled because the British House of Commons lacked the fortitude to crack down hard enough on labor lest labor take over the Government.

* * *

Has Mr. Roosevelt the fortitude to abandon the 40-hour week in America or is he the old political ringmaster who is more concerned with the battle of ballots than with the battle of bullets?

Likely the 40-hour week will be sustained by Congress under the persuasion of Mr. Roosevelt. Then will come a period of watchful waiting to see what happens. Already the golden hours of production have passed. Its silver hours already are slipping through our fingers. Before we know it the bleak November hours will be upon us. Will they find that the program of production launched by the President has not been fulfilled—particularly in the matter of shipbuilding?

In the countries of the enemy, civilians are conscripted as are soldiers. There one finds no favoritism in an all-out war. There one finds no political skulduggery in a national crisis. Only in America—and, partly, in Britain—do we uphold the sophistry that a nation can be half slave and half free, half regimented and half democratic.

With the coming of November, speculation will have ceased. Either we will have produced or we will not have produced. Either our soldiers will be equipped or will not be equipped. Either we will have won or we will not have won.

By that time this country and the entire world will be sure of its appraisal of Mr. Roosevelt. Either he was capable of leading us to victory or he was not.

All these alternatives are too stupendous for us to risk their negatives becoming the positives of history. Nothing should stand in the way, at this late hour, of depriving the United States of a fighting chance to save our way of living.

And, above all, this is no time to engage in securing the permanency of a political party when the permanency of our constitutional way of life is at stake.

Tax 'Hokum'

NEWSPAPER propaganda designed to mollify low and middle income groups who soon will be saddled with heavier taxes has been termed "hokum" by the *Rhode Island Free Press.*

In a recent editorial the publication denounced the "newspaper errand boys of corporate wealth" who "announce that the Government is recovering all, or nearly all, of the fabulous profits through the excess-profits tax law."

The editorial said that the best answer to this "hokum" can be found in the financial sections of the same newspapers that print such stories.

There, the article continued, statistics of the Federal Reserve Board of New York show that in the first nine months of 1941 more than 400 large corporations enjoyed profit increases of 26 per cent over the same period of 1940. The increase from the corresponding period in 1939 was 78.6 per cent. And the profits were computed after allowing deductions for corporate and excess-profits taxes, depreciation, depletion, contingency reserves, and other bookkeeping items, the editorial emphasized.

Five aircraft companies reported 1941 profits which were 38.2 per cent higher than those in 1940 and 171 per cent higher than those of 1939. Four firms fabricating copper and brass for military uses made profits 71 per cent greater than in 1940 and 1,270 per cent greater than in 1939. This, also, was after allowing for taxes, depreciation and other usual deductions, the *Free Press* declared.

"Similar reports were made by corporations producing iron and steel chemicals, machine tools, electrical equipment, textiles, petroleum and railroad equipment. In all cases the reports deal with profits after provision was made for taxes and the other items.

" 'Equality of sacrifice' makes a fine wartime slogan, but isn't it about time Congress and the Administration translated the slogan into action?" the paper continued.

"It would seem that committees of Congress, which are patiently searching for methods of clipping the little fellow still more without losing his vote next fall, could pause long enough to devise legislation to stop the fantastic profiteering which has done so much to persuade many a patriotic American that, as always, this is a 'rich man's war and a poor man's fight'."

Comment

Is This Pro-Axis?

THE *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (March 16) printed an editorial in which the following excerpt appeared:

In the last three months, the United States has suffered a series of disastrous naval and military defeats. Even the gallant stand of MacArthur is a back-to-the-wall action and there is no hope of sending reinforcements to him and his men.

The Japs have swept like a tornado through the Pacific. Pearl Harbor, Guam, Wake, the Philippines are milestones of defeat; so are Hongkong, Singapore and Java. Australia is in danger. The Burma Road, vital to China, has been cut. On the Atlantic, Nazi submarines are sinking many precious ships with invaluable oil cargoes, within actual sight of the coast.

In short, we are losing the war.

Yet what is the picture at home? It is a picture of mistakes, delays, inefficiency, inaction and the piecemeal use of our productive capacities. It is a picture of greed and selfishness and seeming lack of awareness in certain vital quarters that the destiny of America—the destiny of capital, labor, agriculture and the Government itself—hangs in the balance.

Why did Robert R. Guthrie, chief of the W.P.B. textiles, clothing and leather branch, suddenly resign, along with two members of his staff? Because, to quote him, "My efforts to hurry the conversion of as many industries as possible to the war effort have met with continued resistance within the W.P.B."

* * *

Unless the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Detroit Free Press* and other fearless publications told the truth as they saw it, the American press would degenerate into nothing more than a rubber-stamp branch of the Government. For the forthright attitude they have adopted, these journals probably will be called pro-Axis, or pro-Fascist, by the Reds and their fellow travelers in the field of journalism. After a while, these Reds and fellow travelers will make it popular to be "pro-Axis" if they persist in thinking, as did hay-foot, straw-foot Johnny, that everyone is out of step but themselves.

Censorship and Propaganda

THE *New York Times'* Arthur Krock recently expressed some pertinent thoughts on the contemporary censorship adopted by Washington.

Said he:

"The proper and professed object of censorship is to prevent information from reaching the enemy which will assist him and hamper this nation in the conduct of the war. Enemy communiques, by and large, do not prove that this objective has been measurably attained.

"A second purpose of censorship is to keep bad news, such as the casualty lists, from its own citizens on the ground that public morale and fighting spirit might be depressed. Better observers of the American people than the military censors, and students of democratic history as well, impressively dispute this position, but it has prevailed thus far.

"Another use of censorship, which cannot in this instance be proved, but which is an ever-present temptation that other governments have employed, is to conceal errors and losses for political reasons and to prevent the rise of public opinion against civilian officials and field commanders whom the facts would clearly invest with responsibility for the errors and losses."

Closely allied to censorship is propaganda. Censorship aims to keep certain things out of the news, while propaganda endeavors to put certain things into the news. Attempting to build up the morale of a "complacent" people; endeavoring to mitigate the litany of losses suffered by the Allied forces, propaganda is more evident than is censorship at the moment.

Teamed up with the current censorship, recent propaganda verges on the precincts of desperation; for the manner in which both censorship and propaganda are employed suggest they are in the hands of desperate men.

Mr. Krock remarks:

"Whether the growing American censorship is merely the consequence of bad judgment and bureaucratic militarism, or whether misunderstanding of the strength of the people and official interest are also involved in present practices, does not alter the list of the consequences. Among these are: public confusion; suppression of facts (already known to the enemy) on which constructive criticism of the conduct of the war can be more confidently based, and a barrier to legitimate and useful press enterprise that, through American history, has served as a necessary check on official acts and policies.

"Two examples, selected from many, will support the point.

"Several days ago, this newspaper came into possession, legitimately, of a legitimate piece of information. It was that Admiral King would completely instead of partly supplant Admiral Stark, and that certain other improvements in the naval high command would be made. Responsible officials confirmed that the step was impending. But under the so-called 'voluntary censorship,' which is nothing but a masked threat most of the time, release of the information had to be sought from certified branches of the Navy.

"For three days, this newspaper requested that release. Together with confirmation, it was refused, with the usual easy admonition that even to proceed on almost certain knowledge of the facts might give aid to the enemy. Just how, even the admonitors were unable to explain. Late in the evening of the third day, the information was announced generally, canceling the advantages that should and previously always have accrued to alertness and well-organized news gathering.

"Politicians in power, and most military commanders, always want a regimented press. A government gazette, publishing only that which is handed to it by authority and at the time stated, is to them the ideal press. Wartime censorship gives them an opportunity to try to transmute the newspapers into official gazettes, and on high patriotic grounds the attempt is being made.

"Some days ago, it became known that a war vessel belonging to an anti-Axis ally had been sunk in an accident in the Western Hemisphere. The Navy referred questioners to the Army on the ground that the other department was principally concerned. The Army said the ally must determine the question because it owned the vessel that was lost. For two days, the shuttlecock was batted back and forth. Since the Navy had ceded rights of publication to the Army, the formula of the Office of Censorship did not in any way cover the incident, and the ally remains silent, the suppression prevails."

* * *

Germane to this comment on censorship is the super-desperate effort now being made by the Jewish and Communist press to disbar SOCIAL JUSTICE from the newsstands and mail bags. If ever there was desperation, it grins most evidently from the Moscow-inspired leaders of those who are responsible, in the first instance, for having declared economic warfare against Germany in 1933; and, in the second instance, from those who are taking advantage of the war to sovietize this country.

This combination of persons are endeavoring to implement a private censorship of their own, having failed ignominiously to establish a private army of their own. It is impossible for them to desist from their attempt to create a government within a government.

And as propagandists, they clumsily assail the silent Father Coughlin who, for all practical purposes, is dead and buried in a tomb which is sealed with the sign of the current Caesar. Running true to form, this type of publicists who persecuted Christ long after He was crucified, will never learn that by persecuting the silent Father Coughlin they gained for him more followers and for themselves more opponents.

Plenty of Rubber

"THE apparent lack of knowledge of the Government concerning available sources of rubber is incomprehensible," Elliot E. Simpson, director of the Drexsage Rubber Company of New York, declared recently, according to the International News Service.

"One cannot help but wonder," he added, "whether it is ignorance or a deliberate attempt to perpetuate the British and Dutch rubber monopolies after the war."

Mr. Simpson asserted, the I.N.S. said, that hundreds of thousands of tons of rubber can be obtained quickly in South America and Africa.

Moreover, he continued, a Florida planter has discovered a process for developing hybrid hevea rubber which may enable the United States to produce all the rubber it needs.

"The Mexican government is now seeking to obtain the secret process for developing this hybrid hevea rubber," Mr. Simpson said. "The American planter, J. Andrew Tatro of Tampa, Florida, has not accepted the Mexican government's offer because he wants his discovery to be developed 'under the American flag.'

"His secret process was tested by the Goodyear Plantation Company of Akron, Ohio, in April, 1940. The test proved that this man's hybrid hevea rubber is as good as the standard grade crude rubber.

"It can be produced for three cents a pound at a yield of 800 pounds an acre. We paid the British 18 cents a pound for rubber before the outbreak of the Pacific war, and we have now agreed to pay Brazil 39 cents a pound."

The Paganistic Trend In American Magazines

Christian Way of Life Being Undermined

AMERICAN boys are giving their lives to preserve for the rest of us what is known as the "American way of life."

And at the same time certain writers and certain publications are destroying that way of life—or at least the Christian conception of it.

By feeding the public large doses of paganism and subtle drops of anti-Catholicism, sections of the literary world are doing a greater service to Antichrist than Herr Rosenberg's clumsy irreligious propaganda could ever do in this country.

Those American Christians—particularly Catholics—who are so vigilant against anti-Semitism would do very well indeed to expend some of their unbounded energy in denouncing opposition to the Christian way of life.

The citations below reek with paganism. And they are not isolated examples. They are characteristic of modern literature. The moving picture industry, with which we are not here concerned, but which exerts a powerful public influence, also deals heavily in paganism.

Where is the opposition that should arise spontaneously from all quarters of Christianity to combat this evil? True, the Legion of Decency has made some headway in the movie field, but much remains to be done before a thorough clean-up will have been effected. And the only thing resembling a concerted campaign against smut and paganism in periodicals and books comes from the United Catholic Organizations Press Relations Committee, aided by a few Catholic publications of comparatively small circulation. The Jesuit magazine, *America*, probably is the most influential among them.

Perhaps if anti-Semitism, rather than anti-Christianity, were involved on such a large scale, the roar of protest from public and secular journals would be heard 'round the world.

* * *

We say this by way of introduction to the most recent report of the United Catholic Organizations Press Relations Committee. Last September this group of American Catholic laymen presented results of its first survey of anti-Christian and anti-Catholic influences in the magazine field.

Following — reprinted from *America* — are excerpts from its latest findings, some of which are truly shocking, considering that the revealed sources of modern paganism include many of the most widely read publications in the nation:

Ladies' Home Journal (Circulation 3,650,318). September, October, November, December.

Afforded is a striking example of the incalculable damage a magazine story may effect, no matter which way the sympathy is directed. The serial "Marriage Is a Private Affair," unveils a doctor telling a woman with moderately advanced tuberculosis that it would be suicide for her to go through with her pregnancy. He insists on an abortion, though the woman does not want it. In a later issue of the *Journal* appears a letter from a real-life doctor denouncing the story-doctor as dismally wrong in his advice, and introducing hospital statistics to buttress his contention. Comments the real-life doctor: "Since the *Ladies' Home Journal* has a very large circulation, I am sure many women have become unduly alarmed by the opinions expressed in the story." One shudders to contemplate the untold thousands of unborn babies who may have been murdered because of this one story.

"Plan for Parenthood," an article heavily on the clinical side, plugs for artificial semination.

"I Collect People" belittles Lourdes, describes Alexis Carrel as believing "the most improbable miracles" there.

"Journey's End," an essay, says the Bible is to be read "not for religion's sake . . . but as an exercise in magnificant English . . ."

Effective Language

FILTH MONGERS are hard to convince that their lewd magazines, plays and moving pictures form an insidious and deadly influence, undermining the morals of the people, observes the *Southern Cross*, owned and published by the Catholic diocese of San Diego, California.

"They never learned the old truth that barbarous nations fall from causes without, while civilized nations fall from causes within," the editorial says.

"The one language, however, that unscrupulous purveyors understand is a kick in the pocketbook. The Legion of Decency struck successfully at their profits and they were hit where it hurts."

Another effective argument came to light when *Newsweek* attempted to ridicule the Legion of Decency in an article by its amusement editor, one John O'Hara. In protest, an alumnus of a Catholic university sent the following letter to the editor-in-chief of O'Hara's publication:

" 'The last time I saw you was at our happy meeting in Milwaukee. I am only sorry that the meeting did not take place this week so I could have told you the following things: Your editorial on page 68, written by John O'Hara, regarding the Legion of Decency, is one of the rankest bits of editorial atheism that I have run across in a long time. In a world that has as little decency as ours, why kick something like the Legion of Decency downstairs. Religion and the things it stands for are the crutches that I use to get through this rather shabby world. And I don't particularly like to have those crutches kicked out from under me. There is very little that I can do to counteract your article, but *you can advise your Chicago representative not to come for the advertising contract* that was scheduled for your 1942 series of publications. Just forget about the whole thing'."

Saturday Review of Literature (Circulation 28,400). Conspicuous in an issue devoted to books for children, especially for Christmas gifts, was the absence of reverence to books on the Christ Child. Not one story about Christmas was printed in this Christmas-gift book issue.

Redbook (Circulation 1,297,396). October.

"Have You a Religion?" Evil and the existence of a personal devil are denied. The individual, dissatisfied with his own religion, is advised to create a new one for himself. The magazine paid $100 for this tirade against parents: "You gave us the church —the ostrich-minded church, still preaching the doctrines of the 18th century. How could we accept both the church and Darwin?"

American Mercury. September, October.

In "The Anatomy of Loneliness," Thomas Wolfe, referring to Christ, sounds this pagan note: "I can only say that I could not make His way my own."

The story "Say a First Goodbye," glorifies a companionate marriage. In apparent imitation of the *New Yorker*, the *Mercury* used the name of Jesus profanely.

* * *

Harper's prints this by John Steinbeck: ". . . left to her own devices, she invariably drifted to those dirty-faced children who, if they went to Sunday school at all, worshipped sticks and stones in the basement of the Catholic church."

Cosmopolitan (Circulation 1,547,198). January, February.

"New Evidence" gives us a doctor approving euthanasia.

In "The Least Thing," an unhappy wife places her fate on the movements of an ant crawling across a table. If the ant turns one way, she will elope with the man paying for her dinner; if it turns right, she will go back to her husband.

"Marion Alive," described as a "frank and impassioned life story of a modern woman," presents a heroine who, though the mother of three adult sons, decides to spend the night with a man about half her age . . . "all her scruples seemed ridiculous and petty." She concludes: "Love is to do the wrong thing and to know it is wrong and keep on doing it just the same."

"Wild Is the River" makes its worst characters Catholic.

"Sadly Beautiful" unfolds an illicit affair, and implies that anything in the name of love is all right.

"Such a Lovely Couple" presents an ambitious married pair, who divorced, the wife to get a movie role, the husband to get a $20,000 check from the man in love with his wife, for not obstructing the divorce.

In "Sister's Keeper," pre-marital intimacies are treated with considerable sympathy.

"Forgiveness" makes a noble character out of a father who sacrifices himself so that his daughter can get a divorce and begin a new life with a new man.

McCall's Magazine (Circulation 3,150,195). September, January.

"Stay Out of My Life." It is sad to think that young folk may plough through this sexy story.

"No Thief Can Steal My Love." A father and son fall in love with the same woman,

(Continued on Page 14)

What Others Say

When Do We Start?

HALF the parasites in Washington are co-ordinators and fancy-titled people in screwball jobs, doing their best to think of something to start that will outstrip another department doing the same thing.

This does not sound like wartime operations. The people who desperately want to save our country are definitely not complacent about it either.

We have got to be *tough* and *smart* to win this war.

Let's start in our own backyard and convert the Government to strictly essential and war industries.

—*Washington Post*

* * *

More News, Less Rumor

THE BEST WAY to counteract rumor is with fact.

We respectfully suggest to President Roosevelt, who charged that Washington is a huge rumor factory, that the Government may be largely responsible.

This is the most news-hungry nation on earth. Its people have long been accustomed to know what was happening both at home and abroad. Their appetite for news has been whetted by the most complete and free press on earth.

Now, they suddenly find themselves on a starvation diet. And, lacking news, they fall back on rumor. Which was inevitable.

Everybody appreciates that there are many things which cannot be told in time of war. But most everybody also realizes that it is possible to carry a hush-hush policy too far . . .

When our own officials give the American people more news about what we are doing we think there will be less cause to worry about rumors.

—*Pittsburgh Press*

* * *

Public Likes a 'Line'

OF COURSE this Administration has never been conspicuous for telling the public the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

As a matter of fact, it is difficult to recall many instances since the unhappy day of its birth and being where it has related any unvarnished fact or performed any solemn promise or sacred pledge.

However, the public seems to like a good line of blather more than it does an accurate presentation of facts or a conscientious fulfillment of promises.

And this land of ours is a Republic in which the preference of the people prevails.

So was France.

—**William Randolph Hearst**
in the *San Francisco Examiner*

* * *

Combatting Communism

WHILE WE combat Communism by . . . orders and prosecuting active members, seizing literature and property, no effort is made to use the weapons of counter-propaganda against their teachings, especially in progressive or trade union papers

If the fallacies of the Communist propaganda are explained, if Communist affiliates are exposed, and if the agencies behind some strikes were named and the names of the real guides behind these matters were dragged into the light, it is possible that we could reclaim enough of our citizens to make it worth while.

—**Brig. S. T. Wood, *Commissioner***
Royal Canadian Mounted Police

* * *

Red Fifth Column

THE GREATEST fear that haunts the F.B.I. whose men are grim men, not given to necromancy in tasks where very life itself may be forfeit any moment—is the day when Stalin and Hitler make a new deal to quit fighting and both turn on America and other United Nations.

For, on that day, the Communist fifth column in the United States will go into action. The stoppage offered by 3,000 G-men would be like a spadeful of earth tossed against a Mississippi flood!

That the Commies today, being wined, dined, toasted and given the keys to America, might be sending America's factories up in smoke tomorrow, is simply a thought too fantastic for the National Capitol.

Whenever anyone suggests it too loudly or earnestly, certain quarters in high Government circles, laugh mockingly and say: "Red baiter!" And everybody laughs, charges their glasses in the cocktail lounges and cries: *"The Communists! God bless 'em!"*

Bound, fettered and handcuffed, the F.B.I. is watching politics water the weeds of the world's greatest fifth column—and can do nothing about it!

—*Boake Carter*

Planned Economy

IF A PLANNED economy means the assurance to everyone of free movement, the right to property, fair trading, full scope for initiative, and protection from economic oppression of any kind, then by all means let us insist upon a planned economy.

But, if it merely means that we are to be rescued from the money power and the combines, in order to be caught in the clutches of a State or an international committee, then this war will have been too big a price to pay for so trifling an alteration in our fortunes.

–*The Weekly Review*, **London (Feb. 12)**

Why Change Imperialisms?

I FREQUENTLY hear it said that in this war one-fifth of the population of the world supports the Axis and that the remaining four-fifths is behind the United Nations.

This statement has been made so repeatedly that I fear it is generally believed. But let us ask ourselves, is it true? Can we really depend on the co-operation of four-fifths of the world against the Axis?

If the events in the southwestern Pacific are any indication, I think we could more safely say that this war matches one-fifth of the world against just another fifth. It seems to be an unfortunate truth that the remaining three-fifths—at least half a billion people—have no acute interest in the war or even a clear understanding of the issues involved.

In Asia there is a great mass of colonial subjects who today merely stand on the sidelines. And if they have nothing better to hope for in the future than the brand of imperialism they have known in the past, I for one can understand their reluctance to side wholeheartedly with the United Nations.

Yet, I am firmly convinced that these millions would more readily follow the banner of democracy than that of Axis totalitarianism.

—**Joaquin Elizalde, Resident Commissioner from the Philippines**

* * *

Interest Takes Toll

I HAVE slight respect for a class of so-called coupon-clippers to whom the American people have for many years paid tribute. I recognize the justification for the economic concept of interest charge, but I would not have the institution of interest used in such a way as to enslave the American people.

A statement made earlier today that that Government still owes $15-billion of the first World War debt, and the further statement *that we have paid $15-billion in interest on that debt* between the first and second World Wars is a startling matter, and one to give pause.

It is nothing more or less than an illustration of this fact, that when you borrow money to carry on a war you are sure to pay back twice as much as you borrowed, and probably a good deal more, if repudiation is not resorted to.

—**Representative John R. Murdock of Arizona**

* * *

If Paul Were Here

SAUL of Tarsus, a Pharisee of the strictest sect, once a persecutor of the Christian Church, experienced a most remarkable transformation and became a bond slave of Jesus Christ.

If he were here today, I am sure Paul would speak very plainly to the Jews. Would he be stoned again? We do not know. But he would keep on telling that story of his wonderful conversion.

"For the word of the Cross is to them that perish foolishness; but, unto us who are saved, it is the power of God. We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto Gentiles foolishness, but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God . . . If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are past away; behold, they are become new."

Let our Jewish friends quit blaming us Christians as those who are solely responsible for the existence of the so-called disease of anti-Semitism; and let all Christians who are trying to be real followers of Our Blessed Lord search their own hearts to see if there is anything anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, anti-Protestant, anti-Negro or whatnot there, and if so, then with the help of the Divine Physician get thoroughly healed of that malady!

—**Rev. Dr. George Albert Simons,**
Christ Methodist Church, Glendale, N.Y.

Why Mohandas Gandhi Wears a 'Loin Cloth'

It's Symbolic of India's Poverty Due to British Exploitation

A PRINTER'S error recently under an article entitled "What About India" listed the Hindus resident in India as "2¼-million." The fact is there are 239,195,141 Hindus in India. This correction gives us an opportunity to stress the point that Hindus are in the majority in India. Their leader — though not now in office — is Mohandas Gandhi. Intimately acquainted with the great Gandhi was Dr. Muzumdar who, in 1932, published an authoritative book entitled *"Gandhi versus the Empire."*

Now that Mr. Winston Churchill is Prime Minister of Great Britain, Dr. Muzumdar is anxious to apply the four freedoms of the Atlantic Charter to India, the richest single portion of the British Empire.

As we know, democracy does not obtain in India. While rights of minorities were certified in the *Peace Treaty of Versailles*, the rights of this world's largest majority within the Empire were denied.

Prior to 1932, Mohandas Gandhi inspired his Hindu following to seek freedom which was denied them by Great Britain. This Hindu leader was not interested in gaining dominion status within the Empire. His goal was independence outside the Empire.

* * *

Prior to 1932, a Round Table discussion was held at London, England, relative to India's demands. On Monday, September 14, 1930, the Federal Structure Committee opened its sessions. Four days previously the *S. S. Rajputana*, carrying its precious cargo of 100 pounds of flesh and bone, touched Marseilles—on French soil. Down its gangplank walked the Mahatma clad in loin cloth and shawl and a pair of sandals. From Marseilles to Paris, from Paris to Boulogne, from Boulogne to Folkestone and from Folkestone to London went this most important man within the British Empire today.

The Round Table discussion got under way. Spokesmen for the Hindus argued with spokesmen for the Moslem Party. The British, clad in their toppers and spats, enjoyed the contest because London had agreed there would be no liberty for India as long as India could not settle its internal difficulties. As sensible as to say there can be no liberty for England until Conservatives and Liberals settle their difficulties.

Mr. Winston Churchill, though not Prime Minister then, was very voluble. He failed to recognize the imperial importance of Mohandas Gandhi. He failed to prevision what was about to happen ten years hence when imperial troops, driven out of Singapore and retreating from Burma, would find themselves with their backs against the Himalayas and depending for supplies on the peaceful Mohandas Gandhi and his more than 225-million followers.

What the Pope and President Roosevelt combined are to the Roman Catholics in the United States, Mohandas Gandhi, single-handedly, is to his Hindus in India. Mr. Churchill failed to recognize this when he deprecatingly spoke of Gandhi at the Round Table meeting as the representative of "a loin-cloth civilization."

The Hindus in India have remembered those words.

Gandhi could have retorted to Mr. Churchill, had he cared to do so, by saying: You and your fellow politicians in England were the creators of the loin-cloth civilization in India.

* * *

Dr. Muzumdar writes on that point in his informative book, *"Gandhi versus the Empire."* Said he:

"Mr. Winston Churchill deprecatingly spoke of Gandhi as the representative of a 'loin-cloth civilization.' If only Churchill knew! But it is too much to expect that a dyed-in-the-wool British Tory reactionary should familiarize himself with the priceless legacy of Indian culture and civilization. When Churchill's forefathers were wandering in the woods naked, entirely unused to the amenities of civilization, Gandhi's forefathers had already produced the great culture of Vedic society in India and were spreading broadcast the gospel of the Blessed Buddha. Gandhi's loin-cloth is symbolic of India in two meaningful ways: (1) it represents the result of the material degradation to which British exploitation has reduced the country; (2) it represents the true spirit of the East, the spirit of dedication and service. Every taunt flung at Gandhi's loin-cloth is an indictment of the economic exploitation of India by Britain; what is more, it is an index of abysmal ignorance on the part of the reviler of the highly spiritual culture-pattern of the East so nobly personified by Mahatma Gandhi.

"The genesis of the adoption of the loin-cloth by Gandhi shows the sacramental significance of the act. In his younger days Gandhi was, not unlike the Churchills, quite interested in adopting the style of dress that might be the rage of the day. In London as a law student (1888-1891) and in South Africa as a practising barrister (1893-1914) Gandhi wore the European dress. In his homeland for seven years (1914-1921) he wore the full Indian dress of his ancestors. Then came the turning point in his life in the matter of dress.

"In the course of his tour in Madras Presidency, Gandhi was shocked at the sight of nearly two hundred men and women dressed most scantily and shabbily. These people had travelled over 200 miles to have a *darshan* of the Holy Man. (To have a *darshan* is to see and make a reverential bow before the object of adoration, be it a symbol, a book, an image or a person.) Gandhi rebuked them for not being better dressed. One and all, they burst forth into tears and cried: 'The little piece of clothing you see on our bodies is all that we possess in this world!' Gandhi went into retirement and meditated upon the significance of the scene. 'Do I claim to be their leader? Do I claim to be their servant? Do I claim to work in behalf of the downtrodden masses of India? What right have I to so many yards of cloth on my person when less than two yards is all that the masses can afford? . . . Away with all luxuries! Away with the necessaries of life! I must live even as they do—with the minimum of clothing and the minimum of food.'

"Gandhi's adoption of the loin-cloth is an act of sacramental identification with the masses. Isn't the adoption of a loin-cloth a better way of serving the half-clad masses than the acceptance of an automobile by a (supposed) labor leader (Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, for instance) from a capitalist? Isn't the adoption of the loin-cloth nobler than the acceptance of rewards given by capitalist society to (so-called) labor leaders (of the American Federation of Labor, for instance)?

"Long after the Churchills and MacDonalds and others of their ilk are forgotten, the Holy Man of India in his loin-cloth will be remembered. Even as we today, after a lapse of 2,000 years, lovingly remember the humble Galilean Carpenter who, to the best of my knowledge, never wore a derby hat or a pair of trousers; so shall posterity lovingly remember the humble spinner of Sabaramati in his loin-cloth.

* * *

"Questioned about his loin-cloth on several occasions by newspaper reporters, Gandhi showed his characteristic humor. 'You people wear plus fours, mine are minus fours!' And again: 'If this depression keeps on much longer, I shall be the best dressed man on this island (England).' Finally, in a more serious vein: 'My dress, which is described in the newspapers as a loin-cloth, is criticised, made fun of. I am asked why I wear it. Some seem to resent it. When Englishmen visit India, do they forsake their European clothing and adopt our Eastern dress, which is much more suitable to the climate? No. And there is the answer to those who ask why I wear the dress to which I am accustomed, the dress of India. If I came here to live and work as an English citizen, then I should conform to the customs of the country and should wear the dress of an Englishman. But I am here on a great and special mission, and my loin-cloth, if you choose so to describe it, is the dress of my principals, the people of India.' (P.S. Annual income per Indian is $5.00.)

"His Majesty in full regalia meeting the Saint in his loin-cloth—*es ist kolossal!* as a Hungarian fellow passenger put it to me on a train in Germany. Gandhi is the only man on earth who had the audacity to tell the unvarnished truth and say to the press reporters, when questioned, that he found the King's tea reception a boring affair. Asked whether his Majesty had given him any encouragement (in regard to his mission in England), the Mahatma looked up reverently and said, 'Encouragement is given not by kings but by God.'

"It may be noted in passing that the half-naked saint does not approve of bare backs or low necks in women's dress. At Lady Astor's party the Mahatma was 'shocked by the shameless dress of modern women.'

A Key to an Understanding of Gandhi

"I must protest against the attempts of certain well-meaning American admirers of Gandhi who depict him as a dramatizer. The term dramatizer is merely a refined appelation for a 'stunt performer.' Can anyone think of the guileless Mahatma as a stunt performer? Neither the adoption of the loin-cloth nor the March to the Sea was a dramatic gesture. The historic Salt March

(Continued on Page 14)

Letters

SOCIAL JUSTICE aims to make this page a free forum and readers' opinions are invited. Naturally the views expressed are not always those of this magazine. We cannot guarantee that contributions sent to SOCIAL JUSTICE can be returned to the writers. Letters not signed with the writer's name and address cannot be considered, although the name will not necessarily be used. We reserve the right to publish all letters received unless contrary instruction is specifically given.

U. S. A. Must Have Christian Leadership

TO THE EDITOR:

I have lived many years in Europe, with heavy responsibilities in economic and political matters, in every country of Europe, as well as important parts of Africa and Asia.

My conclusion, after twenty years of serious study at first hand, compels me to believe that the confusion of the average American mind results from ignorance of European history, before and after World War I, especially since November 11, 1918, and the factual events since that date and up to Munich.

It seems to have been almost impossible for the American people to separate propaganda from vital facts.

I have never permitted myself to hate any foreign people. I have confined my dislike to the vile conditions existing in Europe that compelled nations to seek some solution for their predicament, and brought forth the various "isms" of which, under ordinary conditions, we cannot approve.

Here in America, in what seems to me almost child-like ignorance, we permit ourselves to be herded into hatred of individuals representing political movements, who, after all, are merely symbols of world pressures, and whose personal destruction would solve nothing.

Knowing at first hand the technique of these minorities who brought so much demoralization upon Europe, and witnessing the fall of great nations victimized by their intrigues, it makes me tremble to see them *repeating that technique here in our beloved democratic—and Christian—America.*

Now that we ourselves have been brought into the war, we must win it. But this cannot be done under any leadership in which our people do not have complete confidence.

Leadership for victory must be first of all American and Christian! *Anything less* will spell certain defeat!

It is time we Americans placed country above party and faced realities. Those who have the courage to point out the realities are all too few. —**Americus**

Salem, Oregon

Have No Fear

TO THE EDITOR:

Heed not those flag-bearers of Lucifer who would smear you. The Communists and those Jews who hate and deny God are striving to make of our nation, founded on Christian principles, another Soviet based on godlessness and jungle principles.

Your publication, SOCIAL JUSTICE, is strong, patriotic, Christian and American. Have no fear. Millions of the reading public await it eagerly each week; every copy is passed around among many readers.

The spiritual messages you sometime print on the back cover of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine are encouraging and helpful. I'm sure that many thousands of your non-Catholic readers are saving them.

We wish they might be compiled into book form. Have you ever considered it? A tremendous sale would surely cover the expense. —**M.A.C.**

San Francisco, Calif.

Congratulations?

TO THE EDITOR:

Congratulations on becoming an anti-Nazi publication at last. The Untermeyer speech you printed is one of the best analyses of the Hitler terror I have read in some time. The late Mr. Untermeyer saw the evils of Naziism back in 1933! It took you nine years — but you made it. —**R.L.P.**

New York City, N. Y.

One of the 84 Per Cent

TO THE EDITOR:

I always have had the same attitude towards Hebrews as Gentiles, except for Communist Jews; in other words, un-American Jews, the ones that are misleading the American people towards Communism.

In the attack on SOCIAL JUSTICE in their January 19th issue *The Jewish Review* got seriously burned. They don't like the way SOCIAL JUSTICE fearlessly tells the truth to the people. I certainly get a kick out of the way they are always acting and yelling. It always sounds like *"Help, Help, Father Coughlin is killing us!"*

Did you ever attend a court trial and notice how the guilty person under questioning invariably shouts out loud, "it's a lie; you're trying to 'frame' me"?

That's the way these Communist Jews act. They know right well that SOCIAL JUSTICE is the Christian American people's whip against Communism. That is what they're afraid of; and they want it shut up most desperately.

At least 84 per cent of the American people are ready to fight until Communism is driven out of our dear America.

—**One of the 84 Per Cent**

Chicago, Illinois

A Marine's Letter

TO THE EDITOR:

To begin with let me inform you that I served my country in the last war in the U. S. Marines; yes, overseas. I was honorably discharged with a permanent disability claim for which this generous Government pays me $18 per month. One of my brothers was in the U. S. Army serving in France at the time I enlisted. My parents sent me away with a smile. My grandfather was a captain in the French marines in his younger days.

Pardon all the personal remarks, but I want you to know that I consider myself a 100 per cent American and have the interest of my country at heart.

I have been and am now a sincere follower of the teachings of Father Coughlin. SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine is perfection itself in its analyses of foreign governments and their disputes, together with a forthright application of the social order principles as taught by Pope Leo.

Today, that dear champion of the social order, the Rev. Father Coughlin, is crucified. Of course, he had expected as much. He knew this was coming to him, eventually, for the power of Satan has been let loose on earth and the evil of darkness rules in high places.

However, our dear Saviour gave us this new voice crying in the wilderness to warn the people. The common people did not heed this warning; therefore we find ourselves and our country in this ocean of fire.

There is only one hope now remaining, a return to God; prayer and more prayer.

We have no one to blame but ourselves for having let false leaders take us in. We have just the kind of an Administration that we have deserved for our lack of interest in "honest money" reform. Had we, the people, demanded in no uncertain terms the reforms as taught us by that voice crying a warning in the wilderness, we would not now be crying our eyes out for that soldier son who will have to take his blood bath in an international war.

It is as simple as that.

What we need—and have always needed for any victory—is the leadership! —**A.J.S.**

Lockport, New York

'We All Must Serve,' We Said: An Outspoken Reader Dissents

TO THE EDITOR:

I have read with much interest your editorial in SOCIAL JUSTICE (Back Page, Jan. 19) entitled, "We All Must Serve."

I doubt that I ever read a more disgusting defense of Stephen Decatur's philosophy of "Our Country Right or Wrong" than this.

You say we all must serve. It seems to me no Christian can support the war effort of our country if the country is wrong. In your issue of December 15, 1941, SOCIAL JUSTICE outlines three conditions which must be met before a "just" war can be fought. It is my belief that no Christian can willingly take part in any unjust war. Therefore, before you tell us that "We All Must Serve," you must prove to us that we are fighting a just war.

We know that the "New Dealers" in Washington deliberately tried to strangle Japan to death economically. We know that her credit was frozen in America. We tried to cut off her oil supply. We refused to sell her goods that were absolutely necessary to her national existence. At the same time we extended credit to her enemies. We gladly supplied them with arms and munitions with which to slaughter Japanese citizens.

You say: "If defeat is ours, the years beyond hold no immediate hope for our children; no reasonable hope for the lovers of religious and civil liberty."

This statement is so false that the exact opposite is true. If we win the war, and I mean from a military and naval point of view, the internationalists will be in the saddle. Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin, De Gaulle, the Rothschilds and the Morgans will control all the governments in the world.

The system of the private creation of money—which Hitler abolished in Germany — and to preserve which the pseudo-democracies, England, Russia and New Deal America are at war, will be continued.

We, the poor, will be bled white with taxes to pay usury to the international bankers, for the fictitious fountain pen credit money" they loaned to finance the war. We will be ground down to the very depths of poverty. Our children will go hungry, naked and uneducated because we will not be able to do better for them.

The few remaining Christians will be driven once more to the catacombs. Slavery will be re-established. Freedom of speech will be outlawed. The press and radio will be muzzled. If any courageous Christian has the audacity to speak out against this he will be "thrown to the lions."

Have you ever stopped to take stock of the U. S. A.? We are about in the position of ancient Rome at the dawn of the Christian era, or, probably, a hundred years later. We have world-wide power, vast wealth, idleness, drunkenness, debauchery, immorality, divorce, birth control, and irreligion among the rich and ruling classes; and poverty, nakedness, unemployment, homelessness, disease and crime among the masses. In addition to all this, the poor are called upon to sacrifice the lives of their sons on foreign battlefields and are bled white with taxes to support the system.

You ask: "With what argument can the 'we will not serve' persons confront such statements?" Well, you have my answer.

Now may I ask: "With what argument can the 'We All Must Serve' persons answer?"

—**M.H.B.**

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Letters

We Demand Fr. Coughlin Back on the Air!

TO THE EDITOR:

Ever since Father Coughlin has been denied the use of the radio in America, his critics have been attacking him more than ever before. And we are supposed to have "freedom" of speech in America!

Where were these critics when Father Coughlin offered them his radio time free of charge?

The reason none of them took advantage of his generous offer was because, in all Father Coughlin's years of broadcasting, they were never able to argue successfully against his Christian principles, but only attacked him personally. And they still do that. Do you hear a single one of his principles, or those of SOCIAL JUSTICE, condemned by these critics?

As for Father Coughlin, or SOCIAL JUSTICE, being unpatriotic, the magazine company bought $25,000 worth of defense bonds and announced that they would refund all the interest back to the young men of the Army and Navy.

Are any of Father Coughlin's critics as patriotic as that, or do they lend their money to the country and exact interest profit on the bonds to be taken out of the blood of our fighting boys, or the sweat of the nation's laborers?

I think it's about time that the followers of Father Coughlin got together and demanded that the priest be allowed to return to the air and defend his good name, and the principles of Christian social justice, which are being extinguished by anti-Christians.

We fought successfully against the hypocrisy of prohibition; we fought, and won, the Soldiers' Bonus; we fought for relief of the starving millions in 1932—why can't we put up one last fight for social justice and for America?

—T.S.D.

Portland, Maine

They Hate Christ

TO THE EDITOR:

In his nightly broadcast over station WHN, in New York City, George Hamilton Coombs called for the elimination of the Christian Front.

He refused to name names, but he referred to an address that was to be delivered in Boston on March 17th by "a man from Brooklyn, New York." We knew from the papers that he referred to Father Curran.

From my simple analysis of these local news broadcasters, I find that they are definitely anti-Catholic.

How long will Christians allow these insults to continue?

—America First

New York City

When Peoples Fight

TO THE EDITOR:

Can it be possible that the peoples of all the Axis countries have less intelligence and less moral fibre than the people of the United Nations?

What do they believe they are fighting for?

Since they, too, are human beings, subject to the natural laws of God, can it be possible that they are fighting for something less than are the people of the United States?

What are the peoples of the United Nations fighting for?

Is the power to starve a people into submission any "safer" in one people's hands than it is in another's?

If there are powerful profiteering and dominant forces at the helm in all the countries of the world, including our own, how will the people of all the countries fare in the event of any out-and-out winner?

Are there not persons in the U. S. A. who are prosperous at the expense, misery and want of many other persons, and does not this make for dissatisfaction, turmoil, strife, sabotage and suffering? And just as it is between the peoples within a nation so it is between nations.

Millions, of all the various countries, are and have been living needlessly in want. Are they truly fighting now to make the world a better place for themselves and their families, or are they fighting to perpetuate the power of those responsible for that misery and want?

Whom and what are the people fighting against?

What and whom are they fighting for?

West Orange, N. J. —A.J.C.

Mennonite Migration

TO THE EDITOR:

In this morning's paper I came across an article pertaining to a migration of a sect of Pennsylvania farmers known as the Mennonites, to Paraguay, South America, where they have established a colony in the hope of finding peace, liberty and freedom—something, apparently, which they can no longer be sure of in this supposedly free land of opportunity.

They are among the most successful peoples in this country, having farmed their lands for generations, and led in land management and agriculture. They always have maintained and supported their own schools, asking no assistance whatever from the Government—in this respect they're not unlike the Catholics who maintain their own parochial schools.

The Mennonites educate their children to become citizens of high character. Such people are an asset to this country. It is to be regretted that their peaceful way of life should be interfered with to such a degree that they must leave the United States, crowded out by a newer and less desirable rabble of refugees from revolutionary Europe.

I have traveled and spoken to these people throughout Lancaster county and other parts of Pennsylvania and have seen their prosperous and beautiful farm lands. What a pity to see these people go!

—A Faithful Reader

Buffalo, New York

EVEN MIRACLE WORKERS NEED PLANES AND TANKS

—St. Louis Post-Dispatch

'They Also Serve . . .'

TO THE EDITOR:

How can we mothers who have sons in the Philippines find out if our boys are prisoners?

My son was stationed at Nichols Field, Rizal, P. I. The last letter I got from him was written November 11, 1941—not a word since the war broke out!

I took it up with the Red Cross. They sent me a letter saying the War Department had not listed his name as lost, injured or killed, but they did not say he was not a prisoner.

I wake up nights so frightened; I seem to hear him calling me, asking for prayers. I can't get back to sleep and I just cry and pray. I can't get him out of my mind for one hour of the day. I live with a constant prayer on my lips for his safety.

I am all alone and have to work every day on the W.P.A. There must be hundreds of other women like me.

—Mrs. I. C. A.

Providence, Rhode Island

Makes a Difference

TO THE EDITOR:

Strange as it may seem, Pearson and Allen in their "Merry-Go-Round" column in the *Washington Times Herald* (Feb. 27) suggest that President Roosevelt might dispense with the "four old men" in his Cabinet—Secretaries Hull, Stimson, Knox and Jones, all around 70.

Reading the comment was somewhat like reading "Rip Van Winkle." Had SOCIAL JUSTICE voiced this viewpoint, Pearson and Allen, in my opinion, would have been the first to stand up and shout, "F.B.I. Investigation!" or "Unloyal Americans!" and all the rest of the smear names they know to fasten on Father Coughlin and the magazine, SOCIAL JUSTICE.

—R.D.S.

Washington, D. C.

Yes, and No

TO THE EDITOR:

Since reading your recent article entitled, "Look at Your Ten Dollar Bill" in the Feb. 16th issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE, I have demanded "good money" instead of Federal Reserve Notes.

They gave it to me at first, but yesterday I was told that my local bank was able to get only a certain amount of "good" money, and that they did not have any for me. They also told me to stop telling other people to demand "good money," or I would get in trouble!

Can I send my checks or Federal Reserve Notes straight to the U. S. Treasury, to have them changed into "good money?"

Do you think the U. S. Treasury will turn me down the same as the local bank did?

—L.S.

Loyal, Wisconsin

Comment

The Paganistic Trend

(Continued from Page 9)

a schoolmate of the mother. Says the mother to her son: "Don't think hard of your father . . . at 43 does it hurt one to feel a bit of a devil? He's worked so steadily for us, been so loyal all these years." The son replies: "Mother, you are simply wonderful!"

Collier's (Circulation 2,790,465). An editorial declared that the present-day dictator "must pretend to a wisdom and infallibility such as even few medieval popes ever claimed."

Atlantic Monthly (Circulation 99,715). December.

An article states: "Mrs. Dewey did not believe in birth control. Notwithstanding her freethinking grandparents, she held some streak of prudish puritanism that made her think it wicked to decide when and under what conditions you are going to bear children." The same article mentions with apparent approval a professor who began his course by remarking: "Now when I mention God, I want the class to relax!"

Another article refers to the "dogmatic tyranny" of the Catholic Church in pre-Reformation days.

Good Housekeeping (Circulation 2,306,596). September, December.

"Just a Boy and Girl Thing" treats of the guilty pair in pre-marital relations approvingly.

"The Golden Road" regards divorce as the logical way out of marital snarls.

Mademoiselle (Circulation 348,116). November.

"Daughters of Gentlemen" gives us young girls indulging in suggestive talk.

Magazine Digest. October.

"Miracles from Mud" infers that it was the mud, not Our Lord, which cured the blind man.

Time (Circulation 805,345). November 17.

A striking example of the manner in which the Church is misrepresented is here given. Throwing its weight against the thesis (which is highly probable) that Jefferson and the Founding Fathers imbibed their political philosophy indirectly from Saint Thomas Aquinas, *Time* trotted out a lot of truncated quotations, lifted from their context, from Pope Leo XIII, by which so said the news magazine, "the indignant Pontiff" denounced most of Jefferson's political principles. By this action, *Time* made it appear that Pope Leo condemned the American principles of equality, freedom, self-rule, popular sovereignty, etc.

Rev. Charles C. Chapman, Loyola University of the South, New Orleans, forwarded to *Time* a long, well-documented communication, pointing out that *Time* "overlooked the fact that all of these principles can be interpreted in an atheistic, Nineteenth-Century Rationalistic sense, or in a Theistic, Christian, Catholic and American sense . . . Leo XIII, in a marvelously clear manner, has separated the true interpretation from the false, giving both.

Father Chapman then discussed at length each principle, quoting liberally from the Encyclicals, and demonstrated clearly that Pope Leo had by no means condemned the principles which *Time* said he did. Father Chapman requested *Time* to correct its distortion of the Pope's teaching, "in justice to Catholics, who, by implication, are accused of un-Americanism."

In a letter, *Time* admitted that "the fuller citations you make from Leo XIII do make it plain that his Encyclical of April 20 has much more in common with Jefferson's principles than the summary of it which *Time* quoted," but stated it would "probably" not print any correction of its erroneous presentation.

Mohandas Gandhi

(Continued from Page 11)

to the Sea was 'an act of dedication to God,' as the Mahatma put it to me. 'This pilgrimage to Dandi is undertaken,' added Gandhi, 'in order to receive the blessing of God and the blessing of man so that I may return to the Ashram with Swaraj in the palm of my hand.' That the march did present itself as a drama, that it did serve as an excellent means for enlisting popular resentment against the British Salt Laws, that it did prove to be the finest stroke of political leadership in organizing the country for Civil Disobedience, that it did attract the attention of the world—these by-products of his act of dedication to God had nothing to do *immediately* with the Mahatma's decision. The course of action was adopted, as it is always adopted, by the Mahatma in obedience to the voice of the inner self. Gandhi's Occidental friends would do well to realize that the statesmanship of the spirit is infinitely superior to the statesmanship of politics.

"I confess my inability to define the precise manner in which Gandhi's inner self works. This remarkable spiritual phenomenon may, however, be of far greater importance ultimately than all the political by-products of the Mahatma's dedication to the voice of the inner self which is the Supreme Self.

"Occidentals! Beware of painting Gandhi after your own image!

"No dramatizer would have turned down persistent entreaties from admirers and friends to visit the United States of America. At the beginning of the Round Table Conference I believed that Gandhi should not visit the United States lest the amount of good-will shown by this country to the Mahatma be interpreted as an inimical gesture by England. But when the British press began studiously to ignore Gandhi and when the British ministers adopted dilatory tactics with reference to the Conference, diverting their time and energies to the electioneering campaign, my Satyagrahist good-will abdicated in favor of ordinary human reactions.

" 'If only Gandhi went to America at this psychological moment!'—such a sentiment surged forth in my breast. The Mahatma's visit to America would immediately change the status of the Indian question from a British into an international problem. The tidal wave of good-will occasioned by his visit to the New World would confound the British public, the British press and the British politician.

"These sentiments were put forth before Gandhi, whose reply was characteristically undramatic—so undramatic that, were I not to record it here, it would never be known to the world. Said the Mahatma: 'You are right from your standpoint. But your chain of reasoning does not appeal to me. The British press ignores me. You therefore want me to go to America. Would not that be a spiteful act? No, under the present circumstances I cannot think of going to America . . . But if the atmosphere here should clear up at the end of the Conference, I should then entertain the proposition for a visit to America.'

"Can such thoughts — expressed privately and not for publication—can such thoughts be attributed to a dramatizer, to a stunt performer?

Gandhi's Humor

"Two instances of Gandhi's humor might be cited. One of the traditional London fogs had settled upon the city one morning when Gandhi was taking his early walk. A delivery wagon almost bumped into him when the driver pulled in the reins of the horse and said to Gandhi: 'It is bad weather, isn't it, Mr. Gandhi?' 'Yes,' replied the Mahatma, 'typically British!'

"In reply to a question on the minorities problem at a meeting of students at Cambridge, Gandhi said: 'Don't think that paralysis has possessed the Hindu, Muslim and Sikh masses in India. Had it been the case I should not have come here to represent the biggest organization in India. But the stupidity is confined to the present company—present company meaning not this house, but the Indian delegates at the Round Table Conference, including of course myself.'

"Typical, again, of his lighthearted mirthfulness is the following incident. In reply to the question, 'Why do Hindus want joint electorates?' put by a student at Oxford, Gandhi replied: 'Because they are foolish. They can take the wind out of the sail of the Mussulmans by immediately giving them separate electorates and leaving them wondering whether there may not be after all something sinister in the separate electorates.'

A Man of Steel

"Gandhi's most important work in England was done not at St. James' but outside the Conference halls. By numerous personal contacts, private talks, frank exchange of ideas and conferences with the lowly as well as the leading men and women of England, the Mahatma attempted to touch the British heart. 'Every minute of his time here, as in India,' wrote Mahadev Desai, 'is pledged to the country, and perhaps there is no one who is going through the same strain as he'."

Irish Villains

THE CURRENT wave of Jewish protests against the alleged anti-Semitism of SOCIAL JUSTICE reminds us of the none-too-subtle touch of "anti-Irishism" evident in current movies and radio dramas.

Probably if we were editorially "on our toes" we would have mentioned this long ago, since many letters have been received at our office pointing out the peculiar fact that an inordinate number of movie and radio villains bear Irish names. Strange, isn't it?

Take that picture "The Maltese Falcon," for example. It's the only one we've seen recently. The murderess is a thoroughly unwholesome person — except for looks. And what is her "real" name in the story? Why, believe it or not, it's *Bridget O'Shaughnessy*. It could just as well have been Smith, Levi or Slapcabbage, since there was no Irish "angle" in the plot. Author of the original story, we understand, is Dashiel Hammett, a leftist of some note.

Readers' Comment on The *Herald Tribune*

Editor
SOCIAL JUSTICE
Royal Oak, Mich.

Dear Sir:

I have noted in the last few days how the internationalists, the war profiteers, the New Deal discredited politicians, and the Jews have increased their attacks on SOCIAL JUSTICE and Father Coughlin.

They do not relish truth-telling. They want to continue their cunning schemes with the American people. SOCIAL JUSTICE is in their way. It exposes them.

The tempo of these attacks has been increasing. You noted the attack of the Jewish *American Hebrew* and the Communist *Daily Worker*. Now, the *New York Herald Tribune* has joined in the chorus. They want something done to stop the one magazine in America which tells us facts.

It isn't all confined to the papers. While listening to the radio, I heard William Shirer, the writer who has become wealthy by writing war propaganda, speaking over the Columbia Broadcasting network. He tried to show a parallel between SOCIAL JUSTICE and papers published in Germany while he was a correspondent there. He was more careful than the *Tribune*, but in a shrewd manner he called for the suppression of this paper.

Of course, it is worth knowing that C.B.S. is headed by William Paley, the son of a Russian immigrant Jew, and that on the Board of Directors are Isaac D. Levy and Jerome Loucheim. While a member of the Senate, Senator Rush Holt of West Virginia showed why this crowd wanted war and their war profits. That might explain some things.

I was glad to read the reply of SOCIAL JUSTICE about Father Coughlin's silence. It shows just how far these enemies will go. Some day, he won't be silent. Some day, the radio will carry his voice to all America.

* * *

But I believe I have some facts about the *New York Herald Tribune* which will interest your readers. On March 15, 1942, this paper referred to SOCIAL JUSTICE as a pro-Nazi weekly. We were glad to read that it said our paper was "the most influential of the publications."

It attacked SOCIAL JUSTICE because SOCIAL JUSTICE said that the British Empire was gone. Even London papers said the same identical thing.

The New York paper has been shouting for war ever since hostilities started in Europe. Some of us wonder if the Jewish advertisers might have had some influence on the editorial policy.

We know how Father Coughlin fought against the international bankers and how he and SOCIAL JUSTICE exposed the J. P. Morgan outfit. You wonder what that has to do with the *Tribune*? Why, I'll tell you: When the *Herald Tribune* was bought from Munsey in 1924, the Reids gave Munsey their personal note for a very large sum. When Munsey died, this note came into the possession of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. J. P. Morgan was chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Museum. Munsey's principal executor, the Morgan-controlled Guaranty Trust, sold the estate. Everyone knows that the Museum has been under the guardianship of J. P. Morgan and Company. There is one tieup between the Morgan group and the Reid family who control the paper. But they have always been friendly and their businesses are such that they have interlocked. Thomas Lamont, partner of Morgan and Company, sometimes writes financial copy for the paper and suggests what might be worth printing. Morgan's partners worked with the *Herald Tribune* in putting Wendell Willkie across.

* * *

In "Lords of the Press" one reads this paragraph: "The *Herald Tribune* openly serves money, wealth, power and the interests Henry George first called 'vested.' It does not serve the people. It makes no such pretension. It is the organ of the ruling class . . ."

This book also shows how the paper supported Cuban Fascism and how the money of the Reid family was invested in Cuba.

But here is something one shouldn't miss. The *New York Herald* printed a Paris edition of its paper. On May 22, 1932, the Paris edition stated:

"Fascism for America"

"The social phenomenon known today as Fascism has existed in many countries . . . Whatever its special characteristic or name, it has always consisted essentially of a mobilization of moral force. The Youth of Germany, ardent to reconstruct the pre-war ascendance and self-confidence of their race, calls itself Fascist." (Note: Remember this was written the year before the start of the Jewish boycott of Germany.)

"The Youth of Italy, bended to stem Communism among the workers and sluggishness and ineptitude in the public services call themselves Fascist.

"The hour has struck for a Fascist party to be born in the United States. In the face of the most critical financial situation in the history of the country, Washington presents the amazing spectacle of more special groups seeking to get their fingers in the national treasury than ever before.

"Someone will give the signal. It may be a mechanic, coming out of the engine room, wiping his hands upon oily waste, in despair at the insecurity of his home; it may be a veteran teacher — like Peter the Hermit preaching a crusade—shocked to find the holy sepulchre of our national liberty in the hands of vandals. It may be the clean youth and imagination of a Charles Lindbergh" (Note: Get that from the *Herald*; but that was in 1932) "calling upon men of good will to join him in a party of law and order. It may be sagacity and experience of a Henry Ford, summoning men to match the organization of the underworld with a still more potent organization. In every part of the country men are waiting for the call, and when it is heard, there will be a roar of assent from a million throats.

"The elements are assembled for the formation of this kind of Fascism in the United States composed of householders, heads of families and taxpayers. The stage is set."

* * *

There was the *Tribune* in 1932. That is the same group now attacking the one honest magazine we have to tell the truth by saying that your paper is pro-Axis.

Keep on telling the truth. The people here are turning to SOCIAL JUSTICE more every week. They are finding out where to get facts.

Very truly yours,
New York, N. Y. H. D.

TO THE EDITOR:

The *New York Herald Tribune* cites certain headlines to prove their statement that SOCIAL JUSTICE is pro-Axis. One of the headlines from this publication is entitled, "Malaya and Singapore Prove British Empire Is Doomed."

The writer of the story does not read the English paper, *Tribune*. This is the paper whose policy is directed by Sir Stafford Cripps. It is in this paper where one finds the Cripps viewpoint.

Recently this paper stated:

"The British Empire is finished. Nothing can save it. Who wants to? (Only Hitler, apparently.) Not the millions who suffered under it. They rejoice to see it go. Ordinary people everywhere have no regrets at its passing. What they desire to ensure is that no other empires rise to take its place and repeat the same squalid story."

What would the *New York Herald Tribune* say about the Cripps paper's statement?

—H. M.

Washington, D. C.

Untermeyer Speech Still Available

WITHIN the last few days we have been besieged with requests for more copies of the March 16 and March 23 issues of SOCIAL JUSTICE, containing the 1933 "Sacred War" speech of Samuel Untermeyer and our comment on that address.

Fortunately, we had anticipated a heavy demand for those issues and increased our normal "press run." This has enabled us to meet all requests to date.

If you did not secure the March 16 and March 23 issues, or if you wish to obtain them for your friends, you still may do so —if you hurry. The supply is limited.

The Untermeyer speech explains clearly who started the economic "Sacred War" to crush Germany; and it tells why, when and how.

Write for it today—and while you're at it why not fill out the coupon below and become a distributor of SOCIAL JUSTICE? You can earn extra money for yourself and at the same time help combat the Communistic and pagan influences rampant in America today.

Special Distributor's Order Blank

....., 19....

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., INC.
ROYAL OAK, MICH.

Please send me detailed information at once so I may become a Special Distributor.

My Name Is .....

My Address Is .....

City or Town .....

State .....

NATIONAL WEEKLY
Social Justice
Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

—And They Killed Christ

FRIDAY of the fourth week of Lent is the Gospel story detailing Christ's raising Lazarus from the dead. Bear in mind that Christ knew Lazarus was mortally ill; that He refrained from visiting his bedside; that He permitted death's mortal course to pursue its way in order to have an opportunity of performing an outstanding miracle designed to convince even the hardest-hearted and most incredulous. "Lazarus is dead," said Christ; and "I rejoice on your account that I was not there that you may believe."

Then followed this well-witnessed miracle with the result that "many of the Jews who had come to Mary and had seen what He did, believed in Him."

Saturday of the fourth week of Lent finds Christ speaking "to the crowd of the Jews, saying: 'I am the Light of the world. He who follows Me does not walk in the darkness, but will have the light of life'."

At this juncture the Pharisees intervened with their charge: "Thy witness is not true." Christ met their argument with these words: "You judge according to the flesh . . . He Who sent Me, the Father, bears witness to Me."

The Pharisees contemptuously asked: "Where is Thy Father?" And Christ excoriated them and their breed with one of the most profound denunciations ever pronounced. He said: "You know neither Me nor My Father." These words mean that the Pharisee Jews did not know God Whom they said they knew. At that date they were practical atheists even though the name of God was on their lips.

Then follows the Sunday Gospel identified with Passion Sunday. We find Christ preaching to a crowd of the Jews, many of whose members for sometime were determined to assassinate Him. Rumors had been spread abroad about His parentage. A well-organized smear had been arranged to assail His character and reputation. But His detractors and enemies, carefully avoiding to contest His doctrines, were content to defame His personality.

At length Christ spoke up. He said: "Which of you can convict Me of sin?" To which the Jews, in answer, retorted: "Are we not right in saying thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil?"

This was equivalent in our day to having said: "Art thou not a pro-Nazi who performs his deeds and preaches his doctrines contrary to the will and law of God?"

Each argument Christ presented was met by no counter-argument. Rather the Jews persisted in reiterating the smear, "Thou hast a devil."

Finally, the Master said to His assailants: "If I glorify Myself, My glory is nothing. It is My Father Who glorifies Me, of Whom you say that He is your God. And you do not know Him, but I know Him. And if I say that I do not know Him, I shall be like to you, a liar."

In this dramatic passage Christ again emphasizes that the Jews knew not God; that they were practical atheists; that they were liars.

This meeting between Christ and the Pharisees ended by the latter taking up stones to cast at Him.

It was always so. It always will be so. The opponents of Christ first resort to employing the diabolical tactics of smear and, then, in employing either the crushing stone or the sharp dagger to sustain their argument.

Monday of Passion Week presents to us the Gospel which begins with these words: "At that time the rulers and Pharisees sent attendants to seize Jesus." It was the Feast of Tabernacles. A great throng had gathered to witness this seizure. And Christ said to the throng, "If any one thirst let him come to Me and drink." He was making His last appeal to persuade the misled people to abandon their false leaders.

Tuesday of Passion Week presents to us a Gospel which opens with these words: "At that time Jesus went about in Galilee for He did not wish to go about Judea because the Jews were seeking to put Him to death. Addressing His disciples the Master said: "The world cannot hate you, but it hates Me because I bear witness concerning it, that its works are evil." Following this statement, Jesus sent His disciples to Jerusalem in Judea there to celebrate the Feast. He Himself remained in Galilee because He knew that the leaders of the Jews were insistent upon killing him. Though He had many friends, there was no one to speak out in His defense: "For fear of the Jews no one spoke openly of Him."

It has always been so. It will always be thus.

Social Justice Issues Containing Untermeyer 'Sacred War' Speech Still Available
(*See Page 15*)